

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 17, 2008, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-12 and 17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 6, 11 and 17 are amended and claims 13-16 are cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter disclosed therein. Support for the subject matter of the amendments to claims can be found in the subject matter of former claims 13-16. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over French et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,651,548) in view of Vuong et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0147042), and Walker et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0123376). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the above-identified application claims a game management system that includes a first detecting device, a second detecting device, a measuring device constructed from a semiconductor pressure sensor and arranged in each of the bet areas in the bet board, a payout calculating device and a managing device, wherein the measuring device calculates a number of chips by dividing the total weight of the chips by the unit weight of one chip, wherein it is determined whether the chip is forged or not by comparing the calculated number of chips by the measuring device with the result detected by the second detecting device, and wherein it is determined that the chip is forged when the calculated number of chips does not coincide with the result detected by the second detecting device, as recited in amended claim 1, and similarly recited in amended claim 17.

The Office Action relies on Walker to disclose or suggest determining the number of chips and determining whether chips are forged (Office Action, page 3, lines 8-14), and combines Walker to the teachings of French and Vuong to arrive at the subject matter of claims 1 and 17. However, the Office Action is mistaken for the following reason.

Walker teaches a method for awarding a number of reward points to a player of a table game (Abstract). Walker further teaches that monitoring devices 1610 and 1620 can comprise sensors embedded in the table that detect information related to the amount of a player's wager (paragraph [0141]; Figure 16). Walker also teaches that pressure sensors may sense the weight of a player's chips, thereby determining how many chips the player has wagered; that embedded sensors may also reflect a beam of light or other radiation off the chip and a sensor may then determine the color of the chip and its denomination by analyzing the reflected light; or that chips contain embedded elements such as magnets that can be detected by sensors embedded in the gaming table (paragraph [0141]). Accordingly, Walker clearly teaches a way of determining the number of chips present on the gaming table, but does not determine whether a chip is forged by comparing the calculated number of chips with a result detected by a second detecting device, as recited in amended claims 1 and 17. Neither Walker; French nor Vuong, disclose or suggest a second detecting device to detect a bet position and bet value of the chip when the chip is betted on the bet area, and that a determination of whether a chip is forged is made by comparing a calculated number of chips with the result detected by the second detecting device, as recited in amended claims 1 and 17.


For at least the reasons above, none of the applied references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the features of amended claims 1 and 17. Thus, amended claims 1 and 17 are patentable over the applied references. Furthermore, claims 2-12, at

least for their dependence on patentable claim 1, and for their added features, are also patentable over the applied references. Thus, all of the pending claims are patentable over the applied references, and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form for allowance the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing Attorney Dkt. No. **02016-00074**.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tarik M. Nabi  
Registration Number 55,478

Attachment: Petition for Extension of Time (one month)

Customer Number 004372  
ARENT FOX LLP  
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20036-5339  
Telephone: 202-857-6000  
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN/cvd